

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary****Application No.**

09/770,289

**Applicant(s)**

SHIOTA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Michael J. Feely

**Art Unit**

1712

**All Participants:**(1) Michael J. Feely.(2) Corwin P. Umbach (Reg. No. 40,211).**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 17 September 2004**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

12,13,14

Prior art documents discussed:

Rathi et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0089992 A1)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A call was placed to Mr. Umbach to propose the cancellation of claims 12, 13, and 14. Newly discovered Rath et al. read on the product-by-process claims. After consulting with his client, Mr. Umbach agreed to cancel claims 12, 13, and 14. It was also suggested to change "in" to "on" in the preamble of claim 1; however, Mr. Umbach indicated that his client was not willing to make this change. The preamble is inconsistent with the body of the claim; however, patentability lies in the body of the claim.